

Construction of Noncommutative Instantons in $4k$ Dimensions

Johannes Brödel*, Tatiana A. Ivanova[†] and Olaf Lechtenfeld*

**Institut für Theoretische Physik, Leibniz Universität Hannover
Appelstraße 2, 30167 Hannover, Germany
Email: jbroedel, lechtenf@itp.uni-hannover.de*

*[†]Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, JINR
141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia
Email: ita@theor.jinr.ru*

Abstract

We consider generalized self-duality equations for $U(2r)$ Yang-Mills theory on $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ with quaternionic structure and self-dual Moyal deformation. We employ the extended ADHM method in $4k$ dimensions to construct new noncommutative generalizations of the 't Hooft as well as of the BPST instantons. It is shown that in the commutative limit the BPST-type configurations coincide with the standard instantons on $\mathbb{H}P^n$ written in local coordinates.

1 Introduction

Moyal-type deformations of gauge field theories arise naturally in string theory in the presence of D-branes and a B -field background [1]. Such theories are also interesting by themselves as specific non-local generalizations of ordinary gauge theories. Among classical solutions of the Moyal-deformed Yang-Mills theory in four dimensions, of particular importance are noncommutative instantons (see e.g. [2, 3, 4] and references therein), which are BPS configurations solving the self-dual Yang-Mills (SDYM) equations [5, 6].

Natural BPS-type equations in more than four dimensions [7, 8], known as generalized self-duality or generalized SDYM equations, appear in superstring compactification as the conditions for the survival of at least one supersymmetry [9]. Various solutions to these first-order equations were found e.g. in [10, 11], and their noncommutative generalizations have been considered e.g. in [12, 13, 14]. Some of these works employ the ADHM solution technique [15] which was generalized from four-dimensional to $4k$ -dimensional quaternionic spaces in [16].

In this letter we consider Yang-Mills theory on noncommutative $\mathbb{H}^k \cong \mathbb{R}^{4k}$, where $\mathbb{H}$ is the algebra of quaternions. Up to $\text{Sp}(k)$ rotations, a self-dual Moyal deformation tensor in $4k$ dimensions is characterized by real parameters $\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{k-1}$, one for each four-dimensional subspace. Using the extended ADHM construction, we find two kinds of explicit solutions, which generalize the 't Hooft and BPST instantons from $\mathbb{R}^4$ to self-dually noncommutative $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$. In the first ('t Hooft-type) case, our solutions univerealize the ones obtained in [14] for a special choice of $(\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{k-1})$ to an arbitrary choice. Note that four-dimensional “slices” of these solutions coincide with the noncommutative n -instanton configurations obtained in [3] or [17] depending on the value of the noncommutativity parameters. In the second (BPST-type) case, we generalize the solution obtained in [14] from $\mathbb{R}_\theta^8$ to $\mathbb{R}_\theta^{4k}$ for arbitrary k . In particular, for $k=1$ this solution coincides with the noncommutative deformation [4] of the BPST instanton [5].

2 Generalized self-duality on $\mathbb{H}^k$

Let us consider the $4k$ -dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ with the metric $\delta_{\mu\nu}$, where $\mu, \nu, \dots = 1, \dots, 4k$. It can be decomposed into a direct sum of k four-dimensional spaces,

$$\mathbb{R}^{4k} \cong \mathbb{R}^k \otimes \mathbb{R}^4 = \mathbb{R}^4 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{R}^4 = \mathbb{H} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}^k, \quad (2.1)$$

with coordinates x^{μ_i} , where $\mu_i = 4\hat{i} + \mu_0 \in \{4\hat{i}+1, \dots, 4\hat{i}+4\}$ is a four-valued index and $\hat{i} = 0, \dots, k-1$. Each such subspace is identified with the algebra $\mathbb{H}$ of quaternions realized in terms of 2×2 matrices with a basis (same for all values of $\hat{i}$)

$$(e_{\mu_i}^\dagger) = (i\sigma_1, i\sigma_2, i\sigma_3, \mathbf{1}_2) \Rightarrow (e_{\mu_i}) = (-i\sigma_\alpha, \mathbf{1}_2), \quad (2.2)$$

where σ_α , $\alpha=1, 2, 3$, are the Pauli matrices. We define a basis V_μ with $(\mu) = (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{k-1})$ on $\mathbb{H}^k$ as a collection of k quaternionic column vectors realized as $2k \times 2$ matrices

$$V_{\mu_0} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{\mu_0}^\dagger \\ \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \dots, \quad V_{\mu_i} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \vdots \\ e_{\mu_i}^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \dots, \quad V_{\mu_{k-1}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ e_{\mu_{k-1}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.3)$$

with $e_{\mu_i}^\dagger$ in the i -th position. A point $(x^\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{4k}$ can be represented by the $2k \times 2$ matrix

$$\mathbf{x} = x^\mu V_\mu = x^{\mu_0} V_{\mu_0} + \dots + x^{\mu_{k-1}} V_{\mu_{k-1}} = \begin{pmatrix} x^{\mu_0} e_{\mu_0}^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ x^{\mu_{k-1}} e_{\mu_{k-1}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

Note that the matrices (2.2) have the properties

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\mu_i}^\dagger e_{\nu_j} &= e_{\mu_0}^\dagger e_{\nu_0} = \delta_{\mu_0 \nu_0} \mathbf{1}_2 + \eta_{\mu_0 \nu_0}^\alpha i \sigma_\alpha =: \delta_{\mu_0 \nu_0} \mathbf{1}_2 + \eta_{\mu_0 \nu_0}, \\ e_{\mu_i} e_{\nu_j}^\dagger &= e_{\mu_0} e_{\nu_0}^\dagger = \delta_{\mu_0 \nu_0} \mathbf{1}_2 + \bar{\eta}_{\mu_0 \nu_0}^\alpha i \sigma_\alpha =: \delta_{\mu_0 \nu_0} \mathbf{1}_2 + \bar{\eta}_{\mu_0 \nu_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where $\eta_{\mu_0 \nu_0}^\alpha$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\mu_0 \nu_0}^\alpha$ denote the self-dual and anti-self-dual 't Hooft tensors, respectively, with μ_0 and ν_0 running from 1 to 4. Recall that the matrices $\eta_{\mu_0 \nu_0}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\mu_0 \nu_0}$ play an important role in the ADHM method [15] of constructing self-dual and anti-self-dual solutions of the Yang-Mills equations in four dimensions. Analogs of these matrices in $4k$ dimensions can be defined with the help of the matrices (2.3). Specifically, we introduce antihermitian $2k \times 2k$ and 2×2 matrices [16]

$$N_{\mu\nu} := \frac{1}{2}(V_\mu V_\nu^\dagger - V_\nu V_\mu^\dagger) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{N}_{\mu\nu} := \frac{1}{2}(V_\mu^\dagger V_\nu - V_\nu^\dagger V_\mu), \quad (2.6)$$

which for $k=1$ coincide with the 2×2 matrices $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\mu\nu}$, respectively. Notice that for any $\mu, \nu = 1, \dots, 4k$ we have $N_{\mu\nu} \in sp(k) \subset u(2k)$ and $\bar{N}_{\mu\nu} \in sp(1) \subset u(2)$. For $k > 1$ there also exists a third tensor $M_{\mu\nu}$ taking values in the complement of $sp(1) \oplus sp(k)$ in $so(4k)$ [16].

To introduce generalized self-duality equations on $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ [7, 16] we define a tensor

$$Q_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} := \text{tr}(V_\mu^\dagger V_\nu V_\rho^\dagger V_\sigma) \quad (2.7)$$

and its total antisymmetrization

$$T_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} := \frac{1}{12} Q_{\mu[\nu\rho\sigma]} = \frac{1}{12} (Q_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} + Q_{\mu\sigma\nu\rho} + Q_{\mu\rho\sigma\nu} - Q_{\mu\rho\nu\sigma} - Q_{\mu\nu\sigma\rho} - Q_{\mu\sigma\rho\nu}). \quad (2.8)$$

Then by direct calculations one finds [16] that the matrix-valued tensor $N_{\mu\nu}$ is self-dual in a generalized sense, i.e. it satisfies the eigenvalue equations

$$\frac{1}{2} T_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} N_{\rho\sigma} = N_{\mu\nu}, \quad \text{while} \quad \frac{1}{2} T_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \bar{N}_{\rho\sigma} = -\frac{2k+1}{3} \bar{N}_{\mu\nu} \quad (2.9)$$

shows that $\bar{N}_{\mu\nu}$ is anti-self-dual only for $k=1$. It is well known that the subgroup of $SO(4k)$ which preserves the quaternionic structure and therefore (2.9) is isomorphic to $\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(k) / \mathbb{Z}_2$.

With the help of the tensor (2.8) one may introduce an analog of the SDYM equations for $U(2r)$ gauge fields on $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$. Namely, we consider a $u(2r)$ -valued gauge potential $A = A_\mu dx^\mu$ and the Yang-Mills field $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu]$, where $(x^\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^{4k}$ and $\partial_\mu := \partial / \partial x^\mu$. The generalized SDYM equations on $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ read [7, 16]

$$\frac{1}{2} T_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\rho\sigma} = F_{\mu\nu} \quad (2.10)$$

and are clearly invariant under $\text{Sp}(1) \times \text{Sp}(k) / \mathbb{Z}_2 \subset SO(4k)$. Obviously, any gauge field fulfilling (2.10) satisfies the second-order Yang-Mills equations due to the Bianchi identities. We remark that (2.10) can be derived as compatibility conditions of a linear system of equations, and its solutions can be constructed via a (generalized) twistor approach [7, 16]. In four dimensions $T_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ reduces to $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ and, hence, (2.10) coincides with the standard SDYM equations.

3 Extended ADHM construction in $4k$ dimensions

The most systematic way to generate solutions to the generalized SDYM equations (2.10) is via the ADHM approach extended to $4k$ dimension [16]. For $u(2r)$ -valued gauge fields this method is based on

$$\text{a complex } (2\ell+2r) \times 2r \text{ matrix } \Psi \quad \text{and} \quad (3.1)$$

$$\text{a complex } (2\ell+2r) \times 2\ell \text{ matrix } \Delta = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_\ell) = \mathbf{a} + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathbf{b}_i(x_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_\ell), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}_i$ are constant $(2\ell+2r) \times 2\ell$ matrices containing the size and position moduli.¹ These matrices must satisfy the following conditions:

$$\Delta^\dagger \Delta = \mathbf{f}^{-1} \quad (\text{invertibility}), \quad (3.3)$$

$$[\Delta^\dagger \Delta, V_\mu \otimes \mathbf{1}_\ell] = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\Delta^\dagger \Psi = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$\Psi^\dagger \Psi = \mathbf{1}_{2r} \quad (\text{normalization}), \quad (3.6)$$

$$\Psi \Psi^\dagger + \Delta \mathbf{f} \Delta^\dagger = \mathbf{1}_{2\ell+2r} \quad (\text{completeness}). \quad (3.7)$$

The completeness relation (3.7) means that $\Psi \Psi^\dagger$ and $\Delta \mathbf{f} \Delta^\dagger$ are projectors onto orthogonal complementing subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^{2\ell+2r}$.

Given a pair (Δ, Ψ) satisfying (3.3)–(3.7), a (generalized) self-dual gauge potential arises from

$$A = \Psi^\dagger d\Psi \quad \Rightarrow \quad A_\mu = \Psi^\dagger \partial_\mu \Psi. \quad (3.8)$$

Indeed, after straightforward calculation the components of the gauge field F then take the form

$$F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu(\Psi^\dagger \partial_\nu \Psi) - \partial_\nu(\Psi^\dagger \partial_\mu \Psi) + [\Psi^\dagger \partial_\mu \Psi, \Psi^\dagger \partial_\nu \Psi] = 2 \Psi^\dagger \mathbf{b} N_{\mu\nu} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{b}^\dagger \Psi \quad (3.9)$$

which, due to (2.9), is seen to satisfy the generalized SDYM equations (2.10).

4 Self-dual noncommutative deformation

Classical field theory on the noncommutative deformation $\mathbb{R}_\theta^{4k}$ of the space $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ may be realized in a star-product formulation or in an operator formalism [1]. The nonlocality of the star product renders explicit computations cumbersome. We therefore take advantage of the Moyal-Weyl correspondence and pass to the operator formalism, which trades the star product for operator-valued coordinates $\hat{x}^\mu$ satisfying the Heisenberg-algebra relations

$$[\hat{x}^\mu, \hat{x}^\nu] = i\theta^{\mu\nu} \quad (4.1)$$

with a constant real antisymmetric tensor $\theta^{\mu\nu}$. The operators $\hat{x}^\mu$ (and thus all their functions) act in an auxiliary Fock space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{k-1}$, where each $\mathcal{H}_i$ is a two-oscillator Fock space.

¹Note that $\mathbf{b}$ is a constant $(2\ell+2r) \times 2k\ell$ matrix, $\mathbf{x}$ is the $2k \times 2$ matrix given in (2.4) and $x_i = x^{\mu_i} e_{\mu_i}^\dagger$ is 2×2 . Correspondingly, $\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_\ell$ and $x_i \otimes \mathbf{1}_\ell$ are $2k\ell \times 2\ell$ and $2\ell \times 2\ell$ matrices, respectively.

The extended ADHM construction described in the previous section carries over to the non-commutative realm without change only for a self-dual deformation, i.e. if

$$\frac{1}{2}T_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}\theta_{\rho\sigma} = \theta_{\mu\nu} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \theta_{\mu\nu} = \text{tr}(N_{\mu\nu}\theta) \quad \text{for} \quad \theta_{\mu\lambda}\theta^{\lambda\nu} = \delta_{\mu}^{\nu}, \quad (4.2)$$

where θ is an arbitrary $sp(k)$ matrix of parameters. We may employ an $\text{Sp}(k) \subset \text{SO}(4k)$ basis transformation to bring θ to the diagonal form

$$\theta = -\frac{i}{2} \text{diag}(\theta_0\sigma_3, \theta_1\sigma_3, \dots, \theta_{k-1}\sigma_3), \quad (4.3)$$

which is characterized by real numbers $(\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{k-1})$. From (4.2) and (4.3) we obtain

$$\theta^{\mu_i\nu_i} = \theta_i \eta^{3\mu_0\nu_0} \quad \text{and zero otherwise.} \quad (4.4)$$

We drop the hats over operators from now on and assume that all $\theta_i \geq 0$; the general case does not hide additional complication.

We introduce an operator version (y_i, z_i) of the complex coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^{4k} \cong \mathbb{C}^{2k}$ via the formulae

$$x_i = x^{\mu_i} e_{\mu_i}^{\dagger} =: i \begin{pmatrix} \bar{z}_i & \bar{y}_i \\ y_i & -z_i \end{pmatrix} \quad \Rightarrow \quad x_i^{\dagger} = -i \begin{pmatrix} z_i & \bar{y}_i \\ y_i & -\bar{z}_i \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.5)$$

which imply

$$[y_i, \bar{y}_j] = 2\theta_i \delta_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad [z_i, \bar{z}_j] = 2\theta_i \delta_{ij} \quad (4.6)$$

and the vanishing of all other commutators. Thus, the two-oscillator Fock space $\mathcal{H}_i$ is spanned by the basis states

$$|m, n\rangle_i = ((2\theta_i)^{m+n} m! n!)^{-1/2} \bar{y}_i^m \bar{z}_i^n |0, 0\rangle_i \quad \text{for} \quad m, n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \quad (4.7)$$

and the basis states in the full Fock space $\mathcal{H} = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{H}_i$ take the form

$$|m_0, n_0; m_1, n_1; \dots; m_{k-1}, n_{k-1}\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} |m_i, n_i\rangle_i. \quad (4.8)$$

Although the operator-valued coordinates (4.5) are defined to act on $\mathcal{H}_i$ only, it is understood that their action extends to the full Fock space $\mathcal{H}$ via $x_i \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes x_i \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{1}_2$. Note that if some $\theta_i \leq 0$ then one should simply interchange the corresponding creation and annihilation operators, i.e. $\bar{y}_i \leftrightarrow y_i$ and $\bar{z}_i \leftrightarrow z_i$.

5 Noncommutative 't Hooft-type solutions in 4k dimensions

Here, we construct a family of solutions to the generalized SDYM equations (2.10) which generalizes the one obtained in [14]. In the notation of section 3 we choose $\ell = k-1 =: n$ and $r = 1$. In other words, we consider $u(2)$ -valued gauge fields acting on the Fock space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}$ with $\mathcal{H}$ defined in (4.8). For the ADHM ingredients $\mathbf{a}$, $\mathbf{b}$ and Ψ (see (3.2) and (3.1)) we propose the ansatz

$$\mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 \mathbf{1}_2 & \dots & \Lambda_n \mathbf{1}_2 \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & & \mathbf{0}_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ b_i^1 \mathbf{1}_2 & & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & & b_i^n \mathbf{1}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_0 \\ \Psi_1 \\ \vdots \\ \Psi_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.1)$$

where Λ_i and b_j^i are real constants. Moreover, we choose

$$b_0^i = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad \text{and} \quad b_1^1 = \dots = b_n^n = -1 \quad \text{but} \quad b_j^i = 0 \quad \text{otherwise} . \quad (5.2)$$

With this selection we obtain

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 \mathbf{1}_2 & \dots & \Lambda_n \mathbf{1}_2 \\ \tilde{x}_1 & & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & & \tilde{x}_n \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 \mathbf{1}_2 & \tilde{x}_1^\dagger & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \\ \Lambda_n \mathbf{1}_2 & \mathbf{0}_2 & \tilde{x}_n^\dagger \end{pmatrix} , \quad (5.3)$$

where

$$\tilde{x}_i := x_0 - x_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, n . \quad (5.4)$$

Let us plug the above ansatz into the ADHM conditions (3.3)–(3.7). To this end we first observe that, using (4.5) and (4.6),

$$\tilde{x}_i^\dagger \tilde{x}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{r}_i^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{r}_i^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{r}_i^2 - 2(\theta_0 + \theta_i) & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{r}_i^2 + 2(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$\tilde{r}_i^2 := (\bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_i)(y_0 - y_i) + (\bar{z}_0 - \bar{z}_i)(z_0 - z_i) + 2(\theta_0 + \theta_i) = (\tilde{r}_i^2)^\dagger . \quad (5.6)$$

It follows that $[\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{x}_i^\dagger] = -2(\theta_0 + \theta_i) \sigma_3$. The special case $\theta_0 = -\theta_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ was considered in [14]. Here, we choose $\theta_0, \theta_i \geq 0$ and describe more general solutions. The operator $\tilde{r}_i^2$ is invertible on the Fock space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i \right)$ unless $\theta_0 = \theta_i = 0$ (the commutative case).

One can easily check that the matrices in (5.3) satisfy the conditions (3.3) and (3.4). Next, the equation (3.5) becomes

$$\Lambda_i \Psi_0 + \tilde{x}_i^\dagger \Psi_i = \mathbf{0}_2 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, \dots, n , \quad (5.7)$$

which is solved by the ‘seed solution’

$$\tilde{\Psi}_0 = \varphi_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Psi}_i = -\tilde{x}_i \frac{\Lambda_i}{\tilde{r}_i^2} \varphi_n^{-\frac{1}{2}} , \quad (5.8)$$

with φ_n to be determined. Further, the normalization (3.6) fixes

$$\varphi_n = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\Lambda_i^2}{\tilde{r}_i^2} . \quad (5.9)$$

Hence, this seed solution $\tilde{\Psi}$ based on the form (5.3) for Δ satisfies all ADHM conditions except possibly for (3.7).

A violation of the completeness relation (3.7) simply means that our seed solution does not catch the full kernel of the operator $\Delta^\dagger$. To find the zero eigenvalues of $\Delta^\dagger$, we look for the kernel of $\tilde{x}_i^\dagger$,

$$\tilde{x}_i^\dagger |B_i\rangle = -i \begin{pmatrix} z_0 - z_i & \bar{y}_0 - \bar{y}_i \\ y_0 - y_i & -\bar{z}_0 + \bar{z}_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\beta_i\rangle \\ |\beta'_i\rangle \end{pmatrix} = 0 \quad (\text{no sum over } i) . \quad (5.10)$$

For our choice $\theta_0 + \theta_i \geq 0$, the creation/annihilation character in (4.6) implicates that the solution is given by coherent states for the corresponding Heisenberg-Weyl group,²

$$|\beta_i\rangle = N_i \exp\left(\frac{\beta_i^y(\tilde{y}_0 - \tilde{y}_i)}{\sqrt{2(\theta_0 + \theta_i)}}\right) \exp\left(\frac{\beta_i^z(\tilde{z}_0 - \tilde{z}_i)}{\sqrt{2(\theta_0 + \theta_i)}}\right) |0, 0; *, *, \dots; 0, 0; *, *, \dots\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad |\beta'_i\rangle = 0, \quad (5.11)$$

where $*$ indicates an arbitrary entry and N_i normalizes to $\langle\beta_i|\beta_i\rangle = 1$. Clearly, the kernel has infinite dimension. In the simplest case ($*$ = 0), the Moyal-Weyl image of the projector $|\beta_i\rangle\langle\beta_i|$ is a gaussian centered at

$$(\beta_i^y, \beta_i^z, 0, 0, \dots, -\beta_i^y, -\beta_i^z, \dots, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^{2n+2} \cong \mathbb{R}^{4n+4}. \quad (5.12)$$

For the full projector onto the kernel of $\hat{x}_i^\dagger$ we may write

$$P_i := |B_i\rangle\langle B_i| = \begin{pmatrix} |\beta_i\rangle\langle\beta_i| & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{1}_2 - \tilde{x}_i \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_i^2} \tilde{x}_i^\dagger, \quad (5.13)$$

so that (no sums over i)

$$\tilde{x}_i^\dagger \Phi_i = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Phi_i = P_i Z_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5.14)$$

where the Z_i are arbitrary 2×2 matrices with operator entries. Therefore, the modified solution

$$\Psi_0 := \tilde{\Psi}_0 S^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_i := \tilde{\Psi}_i S^\dagger + \Phi_i \quad (5.15)$$

also satisfies the equations (5.7). Here, $S^\dagger$ is a not-yet-defined 2×2 operator-valued matrix which is allowed due to the linearity of (5.7) and needed for a re-normalization of Ψ .

To accomplish the construction of a solution to the ADHM equations (3.5)–(3.7), we choose

$$Z_i = \begin{pmatrix} |\beta_i\rangle\langle i-1| & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \Phi_i = \begin{pmatrix} |\beta_i\rangle\langle i-1| & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow P_i = \Phi_i \Phi_i^\dagger \quad (5.16)$$

with

$$|i-1\rangle := |i-1, 0; 0, 0; \dots; 0, 0\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (5.17)$$

Inserting (5.15) with (5.16) into the normalization (3.6) we learn that $S S^\dagger + \sum_i \Phi_i^\dagger \Phi_i = \mathbf{1}_2$, i.e.

$$S S^\dagger = \mathbf{1}_2 - \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^n |i-1\rangle\langle i-1| & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow S = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{l \geq 0} |l+n\rangle\langle l| & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.18)$$

whence S is a shift operator in the Fock space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{H}$. Having defined all the ‘ingredients’ $\tilde{\Psi}$, Φ_i and S of the solution (Δ, Ψ) , one can show by direct calculation that the completeness relation (3.7) is now satisfied. Therefore, we can define a gauge potential via (3.8) and obtain from (3.9) a self-dual gauge field on $\mathbb{R}_\theta^{4n+4}$.

²In [14], the special choice $\theta_0 = -\theta_i \geq 0$ implied $\tilde{x}_i^\dagger \tilde{x}_i = \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_i^\dagger = \tilde{r}_i^2 \mathbf{1}_2$ and therefore $|B_i\rangle = 0$, i.e. no zero modes.

Note that one may restrict our solution to a subspace $\mathbb{R}_{\theta_i}^4 \subset \mathbb{R}_{\theta}^{4n+4}$. For instance, the potential $A_{\mu_0} = \Psi^\dagger \partial_{\mu_0} \Psi$ and its field strength

$$F_{\mu_0 \nu_0} = 2\Psi^\dagger \mathbf{b} N_{\mu_0 \nu_0} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{b}^\dagger \Psi = 2\Psi^\dagger \mathbf{b} \begin{pmatrix} \eta_{\mu_0 \nu_0} & \dots & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{0}_2 \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{f} \mathbf{b}^\dagger \Psi \quad (5.19)$$

do not contain any derivative with respect to $x^{\mu_1}, \dots, x^{\mu_n}$. If we employ the Moyal-Weyl transform and take $\theta_i \rightarrow 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ but keep $\theta_0 \neq 0$, we recover the noncommutative 't Hooft-type n -instanton solution in four dimensions as derived in [3]. The role of translational moduli in this solution will be played by coordinates x^{μ_i} on the space $\mathbb{R}^{4n}$ which complements $\mathbb{R}_{\theta_0}^4$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\theta_0}^4 \times \mathbb{R}^{4n}$. On the other hand, for $\theta_0 = -\theta_i$ the solution (5.19) on $\mathbb{R}_{\theta_0}^4$ will reproduce the solution from [17].

6 Noncommutative BPST-type solution in $4k$ dimensions

In the commutative case, as it was explained in [16], the 't Hooft-type ansatz of the previous section produces solutions of the Yang-Mills equations on $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ which cannot be extended to the quaternionic projective space $\mathbb{H}P^k$ if $k \geq 2$. Hence, these solutions cannot have finite Pontryagin indices p_j with $j \geq 2$. We shall now consider a different kind of ansatz for $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ in (3.2), which generates true instanton-type configurations (with finite Pontryagin numbers) since in the commutative limit $\theta_i \rightarrow 0$ they can be extended to $\mathbb{H}P^k$.

We pick the gauge group $U(2k)$ (i.e. $r = k$ in (3.1) and (3.2)) and consider the noncommutative space $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ with coordinates (4.5) satisfying the commutation relations (4.6). Let us choose

$$\mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda \mathbf{1}_2 \\ \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{0}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \mathbf{1}_2 & & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & \dots & \mathbf{1}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.1)$$

as $(2k+2) \times 2$ and $(2k+2) \times 2k$ matrices, i.e. taking $\ell = 1$ in (3.1) and (3.2). We obtain

$$\Delta = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} \mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda \mathbf{1}_2 \\ x_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_{k-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda \mathbf{1}_2 \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Delta^\dagger \Delta = \left(\Lambda^2 + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} x^{\mu_i} x^{\mu_i} \right) \mathbf{1}_2 =: \gamma^2 \mathbf{1}_2. \quad (6.2)$$

Furthermore, we introduce the $2k \times 2k$ matrix

$$\Phi := \mathbf{1}_{2k} - \mathbf{x} (\gamma^2 + \Lambda \gamma)^{-1} \mathbf{x}^\dagger = \Phi^\dagger \quad (6.3)$$

and the $(2k+2) \times 2k$ matrix

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} -\gamma^{-1} \mathbf{x}^\dagger \\ \Phi \end{pmatrix} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Psi^\dagger = (-\mathbf{x} \gamma^{-1} \quad \Phi), \quad (6.4)$$

which obey the relations

$$\Phi^2 = \mathbf{1}_{2k} - \mathbf{x} \gamma^{-2} \mathbf{x}^\dagger, \quad \Phi \mathbf{x} = \Lambda \mathbf{x} \gamma^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{x}^\dagger \Phi = \Lambda \gamma^{-1} \mathbf{x}^\dagger. \quad (6.5)$$

It is not difficult to see that, due to the identities (6.5), the matrix Ψ from (6.4) satisfies all ADHM conditions (3.3)–(3.7) with Δ given in (6.2). Hence, for this solution (Δ, Ψ) the gauge field (3.9) satisfies the self-duality equations (2.10) (and the full Yang-Mills equations) on $\mathbb{R}_\theta^{4k}$. Note that for $k = 1$ this solution reproduces the noncommutative one-instanton solution as derived in [4], and for $\theta_0 \rightarrow 0$ it coincides with the BPST instanton [5].

In the fully commutative limit, $\theta_i \rightarrow 0$ for $i = 0, \dots, k-1$, the gauge potential $A = \Psi^\dagger d\Psi$ gives an instanton-type canonical $sp(k)$ -connection³ on the Stiefel bundle

$$\mathrm{Sp}(k+1)/\mathrm{Sp}(1) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Sp}(k)} \mathbb{H}P^k \quad (6.6)$$

over $\mathbb{H}P^k$ [18]. In this context, Ψ of (6.4) is a $(2k+2) \times 2k$ matrix-valued section of this bundle. Clearly, in the commutative limit our solution of the generalized SDYM equations on $\mathbb{R}_\theta^{4k}$ given by (3.8), (3.9) and (6.1)–(6.4) turns into the instanton solution on $\mathbb{H}P^k$ written in local coordinates on a patch $\mathbb{R}^{4k}$ of $\mathbb{H}P^k$.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to A.D. Popov for fruitful discussions and useful comments. T.A.I. acknowledges the Heisenberg-Landau program and the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (grant 06-01-00627-a) for partial support and the Institut für Theoretische Physik der Leibniz Universität Hannover for its hospitality. The work of O.L. was partially supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

References

- [1] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, J. High Energy Phys. **09** (1999) 032 [hep-th/9908142];
M.R. Douglas and N.A. Nekrasov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** (2001) 977 [hep-th/0106048];
R.J. Szabo, Phys. Rept. **378** (2003) 207 [hep-th/0109162].
- [2] N. Nekrasov and A. Schwarz, Commun. Math. Phys. **198** (1998) 689 [hep-th/9802068];
N.A. Nekrasov, Commun. Math. Phys. **241** (2003) 143 [hep-th/0010017];
C.S. Chu, V.V. Khoze and G. Travaglini, Nucl. Phys. **B621** (2002) 101 [hep-th/0108007];
M. Hamanaka, Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 085022 [hep-th/0109070].
- [3] O. Lechtenfeld and A.D. Popov, J. High Energy Phys. **03** (2002) 040 [hep-th/0109209];
Y. Tian and C.J. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 045016 [hep-th/0210163].
- [4] K. Furuuchi, J. High Energy Phys. **03** (2001) 033 [hep-th/0010119];
Z. Horváth, O. Lechtenfeld and M. Wolf, J. High Energy Phys. **12** (2002) 060 [hep-th/0211041].
- [5] A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov, A.S. Schwarz and Y.S. Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. B **59** (1975) 85.

³Recall that $sp(k) \subset u(2k)$.

- [6] R.S. Ward, Phys. Lett. A **61** (1977) 81;
M. F. Atiyah and R. S. Ward, Commun. Math. Phys. **55** (1977) 117.
- [7] E. Corrigan, C. Devchand, D.B. Fairlie and J. Nuyts, Nucl. Phys. **B214** (1983) 452;
R.S. Ward, Nucl. Phys. **B236** (1984) 381.
- [8] S.K. Donaldson, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **50** (1985) 1; Duke Math. J. **54** (1987) 231;
K. Uhlenbeck and S.-T. Yau, Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986) 257; *ibid.* **42** (1989) 703.
- [9] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz and E. Witten,
Superstring Theory, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.
- [10] D.B. Fairlie and J. Nuyts, J. Phys. **A17** (1984) 2867;
S. Fubini and H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. **B155** (1985) 369;
A.D. Popov, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A7** (1992) 2077; Europhys. Lett. **19** (1992) 465;
T.A. Ivanova and A.D. Popov,
Lett. Math. Phys. **24** (1992) 85; Theor. Math. Phys. **94** (1993) 225.
- [11] M. Günaydin and H. Nicolai, Phys. Lett. **B351** (1995) 169 [hep-th/9502009];
E.G. Floratos, G.K. Leontaris, A.P. Polychronakos and R. Tzani,
Phys. Lett. **B421** (1998) 125 [hep-th/9711044];
H. Kanno, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **135** (1999) 18 [hep-th/9903260];
E.K. Loginov, Phys. Lett. **B618** (2005) 265 [hep-th/0505258].
- [12] M. Mihailescu, I.Y. Park and T.A. Tran, Phys. Rev. **D64** (2001) 046006 [hep-th/0011079];
E. Witten, J. High Energy Phys. **04** (2002) 012 [hep-th/0012054];
P. Kraus and M. Shigemori, J. High Energy Phys. **06** (2002) 034 [hep-th/0110035];
M. Hamanaka, Y. Imaizumi and N. Ohta, Phys. Lett. **B529** (2002) 163 [hep-th/0112050];
D.S. Bak, K.M. Lee and J.H. Park, Phys. Rev. **D66** (2002) 025021 [hep-th/0204221];
Y. Hiraoka, Phys. Rev. **D67** (2003) 105025 [hep-th/0301176].
- [13] A.D. Popov, A.G. Sergeev and M. Wolf, J. Math. Phys. **44** (2003) 4527 [hep-th/0304263];
T.A. Ivanova and O. Lechtenfeld, Phys. Lett. **B567** (2003) 107 [hep-th/0305195];
O. Lechtenfeld, A.D. Popov and R.J. Szabo,
J. High Energy Phys. **12** (2003) 022 [hep-th/0310267];
J. High Energy Phys. **09** (2006) 054 [hep-th/0603232];
A.D. Popov and R.J. Szabo, J. Math. Phys. **47** (2006) 012306 [hep-th/0504025];
T. A. Ivanova and O. Lechtenfeld, Phys. Lett. B **639** (2006) 407 [hep-th/0603125].
- [14] T.A. Ivanova and O. Lechtenfeld, Phys. Lett. **B612** (2005) 65 [hep-th/0502117].
- [15] M.F. Atiyah, N.J. Hitchin, V.G. Drinfeld and Y.I. Manin, Phys. Lett. A **65** (1978) 185.
- [16] E. Corrigan, P. Goddard and A. Kent, Commun. Math. Phys. **100** (1985) 1;
M.M. Capria and S.M. Salamon, Nonlinearity, **1** (1988) 517.
- [17] T.A. Ivanova, O. Lechtenfeld and H. Müller-Ebhardt,
Mod. Phys. Lett. A **19** (2004) 2419 [hep-th/0404127].
- [18] M.S. Narasimhan and S. Ramanan, Amer. J. Math. **83** (1961) 563; *ibid.* **85** (1963) 223;
J.A. Wolf, J. Math. Mech. **14** (1965) 1033.